

destroys the intent of the total bill and that is to protect a child from difficult and traumatic court room appearances. Thank you.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Scofield. There is one additional light on. That is Senator Hoagland. Now, apparently with some on the floor discussion that I saw, this little burst of activity down here, there is a substitute motion by Senator Johnson. Senator Johnson, do you wish to explain this flurry of activity for us?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Well, I got so involved, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, with a moral obligation, I didn't have time to go over this amendment that carefully. Senator Hoagland has come to me and said that he understands the points made by the amendment. He has simply suggested that when we limit the application of LB 90 to a child-victim as opposed to a child-witness that we make it read "child who is an alleged victim of a felony offense" and he adds the words "of a felony offense." Senator Hoagland also suggests that we leave in the bill a little provision I was going to strike which would have always allowed the defense attorney to be present when a deposition of a child-victim was taken, to leave in the bill that the defense attorney can be present unless the court otherwise rules. So my amendment doesn't go quite as far as Senator Scofield might be afraid it would go. On the other hand, it does limit the contours of this bill to child-victims, and deletes child-witnesses.

SENATOR LANDIS: There is one light on the Senator Johnson substitute amendment and that is Senator Hoagland. Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Yes, let me just state briefly that Senator Johnson has now amended his amendment so it does not change the right to confrontation balance that is set out in the amendments. What his amendment would continue to do is limit the bill to child-victims and not allow the use of videotape depositions or in camera testimony transmitted from the judge's chambers to the court room by way of television monitor in the case of a child-witness. Now, so that is the issue and I guess I would leave it up to all of you. I am not at liberty to bind the sponsors of this bill. I would just...I think all of you understanding what the issue is, you can use your own judgment. I see no harm in, because this is going to have to be tested in the Nebraska Supreme Court in any event, I personally see no